

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters and Objections

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as being informal and requires correction thereof. The Applicants submit substitute drawings herewith to comply with the Examiner's requirement, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection. The Applicants note that the formal drawings correct an inadvertent drafting error in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 present in the drawings as submitted. Such corrections are supported in ¶¶ [0031] and [0036]. Annotated drawing sheets are submitted herewith detailing the corrections.

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to incorrect labeling of an element in paragraph [0031]. In response, the Applicants have amended the specification to correct this inadvertent error and appreciate the Examiner's diligence in finding and bringing these errors to their attention.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,825,782 to Roohparvar in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,433,413 to Fasang. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1, *e.g.*, includes the limitation of “a pseudo-memory, coupled to said bit pattern distribution circuitry, that receives a portion of said probe bit pattern and causes said portion to bypass said memory arrays.” The combination of Roohparvar and Fasang does not teach a pseudo-memory that causes a portion of a probe bit pattern to bypass a memory array. Furthermore, the Applicants do not find any suggestion of such a limitation. Thus Claim 1 is nonobvious over the cited combination. By similar reasoning, claims 8 and 15 are also nonobvious.

Accordingly the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-7, 11-14 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roohparvar and Fasang, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,553,082 to Connor, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

As set forth above, the combination of Roohparvar and Fasang does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claims 1, 8 and 15. Connor fails to cure the deficiency of Roohparvar and Fasang. The Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in Connor of a pseudo-memory that causes a portion of a probe bit pattern to bypass a memory array. Thus, the combination of

Roohparvar, Fasang and Connor fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims, and the claims are nonobvious. Accordingly the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4-7, 11-14 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



David H. Hitt
Registration No. 33,182

Dated: October 13, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800